

REMARKS

Drawings

The Examining Attorney has objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5) as they do not include the following reference numerals mentioned in the description: 162, 106, 114, 118, 138, 150, 158, 146, 154, 158, 166, 242, 246 and 252. Appropriate reference numerals have been added to the drawings or removed from the description. Drawings showing Figures 1 and 5 with proposed corrections are attached.

Specification

Applicant has perused the specification to detect any missing details not noticed by the Examiner.

It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has evoked sixth paragraph, means-plus-function language to define Applicant's invention. Therefore the Examiner has required the Applicant to amend the specification pursuant to 37 CFR §1.75(d) to explicitly state, with reference to the terms and phrases of the claim element, what structure, materials, and acts perform the function recited in the claim element. The Examiner has also objected to the claims for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Applicant respectfully traverses these objections. While Claim 1 employs means-plus-function language for certain claim elements, each of such elements are explicitly described in Claims 2-7 with the required particularity, providing detailed structure for each element. Further, the Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiment exactly mirrors these claims and further adds reference numerals that correspond to the drawings further identifying the particular

structures involved in the means-plus-function elements. Applicant maintains that because of this identification the specification and the claims satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR §1.75(d).

Claim Rejections

Applicant agrees that Claims 1, 4 and 5 are anticipated by *Kornberg* under 35 USC §102 and that Claim 3 is obvious under *Kornberg* in view of *Vallelunga et al.* under 35 USC §103, However, the Examiner has suggested that Claim 2 would be patentable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has cancelled Claim 1 and combined Claim 2 with the limitations of Claim 1, thus new Claim 2 should now be allowable. Claims 3-5 have been amended to depend from Claim 2. With the additional limitations of new Claim 2, Claims 3-5 should also now be allowable. Applicant also asserts that new Claim 2 is a generic claim linking Claims 6 and 7 and that as Claim 2 should now be allowable, Claims 6 and 7 should also be allowable. Therefore Applicant respectfully requests that Claims 6 and 7 be reentered into the application.

Applicant submits, therefore, that with the above-suggested changes to the drawings, specification, drawings and claims and based on the above arguments, the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BELASCO JACOBS & TOWNSLEY, LLP

Dated: December 19, 2003

By: 

David A. Belasco
Registration No. 41,609
Attorney for Applicant